## DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

ORIGINAL

Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSISTERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSISTERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

To: The Honorable Joseph Chachkin Administrative Law Judge

## RAINBOW BROADCASTING, LIMITED OPPOSITION TO PRESS PETITION FOR UNWINDING OF WRBW(TV) ASSIGNMENT

Rainbow Broadcasting, Limited (RBL) hereby opposes the "Petition for Order Requiring the Unwinding of the Assignment of Station WRBW(TV)," filed by Press Broadcasting Company (Press) on February 12, 1996.

Press' petition should be dismissed because it seeks to have the A.L.J. overrule a determination already made by the Commission. In its **Designation Order** in this proceeding the Commission addressed its previous **Order**, 9 F.C.C. Rcd. 2839 (1994), granting the assignment of the Channel 65 permit from Rainbow Broadcasting Company to Rainbow Broadcasting, Limited, and said the 1994 **Order** 

No. of Copies rec'd

"SHALL REMAIN IN EFFECT . . . until the hearing is concluded and all issues finally resolved." Contrary to Press' assumption (Petition, page 2), the Commission did not order the return to "the status quo ante". RBL has operated and does operate Channel 65. If RBC's qualifications are affirmed, RBL will continue to operate Channel 65; if RBC is ultimately held disqualified and it is ordered to turn in its permit, RBL will return the Channel 65 permit to the Commission. There is neither irregularity nor impropriety in the present circumstance; RBC and RBL have done precisely what the Commission authorized and Press' effort to have the A.L.J. revisit the Commission's determination is improper. The A.L.J.'s lack of jurisdiction to modify the Commission's Order dictates dismissal of Press' Petition.

Press is apparently seeking action by the A.L.J. because Rule 1.106(a) precludes a petition for reconsideration of a designation order unless it "relates to an adverse ruling with respect to petitioner's participation in the proceeding." Moreover, even when reconsideration is available under 1.106(a), it must be filed within 30 days of release of the designation order (which here was issued on November 22, 1995); even the Commission itself has only 30 days in which to reconsider such an action.

Finally, the cases cited by Press add nothing to its request. They stand for the undisputed proposition that in appropriate instances the Commission may order the unwinding of certain transactions. That this case does not present an appropriate circumstance has already been determined by the Commission itself, which formally determined against such action pending the outcome of this proceeding. Thus Press' Petition is in all respects lacking in merit and should be dismissed or denied.

Respectfully submitted,

Margot Polivy RENOUF & POLIVY

1532 Sixteenth Street, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20036

202.265.1807

Counsel for Rainbow Broadcasting, Limited

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing Rainbow Broadcasting, Limited Opposition to Press Petition for Unwinding of WRBW(TV) Assignment were sent first class mail, postage prepaid, this twenty second day of February 1996, to the following:

David Silberman, Esquire Stewart A. Block, Esquire Office of the General Counsel Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, N.W., Room 602 Washington, D.C. 20554

Harry F. Cole, Esquire
Bechtel & Cole, Chartered
1901 L Street, N.W.
Suite 250
Washington, D.C. 20036
Counsel for Press Broadcasting Company, Inc.

Charles Dziedzic, Esquire Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, N.W., Room 720 Washington, D.C. 20554

Bruce A. Eisen, Esquire Kaye, Scholer, Fierman, Hayes & Handler, LLP 901 Fifteenth Street, N.W., Suite 1100 Washington, D.C. 20005 Counsel for Rainbow Broadcasting Company

Katrina Renouf